

## **REMARKS**

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed January 12, 2005.

### **ALLOWED CLAIMS**

The undersigned gratefully acknowledges the allowance of Claims 8-24, 30 and 31.

### **CLAIMS REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A)**

Claims 1, 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 02-3556 to Kawasaki in view of Markham (U.S. Pat. No. 4,023,151). For the following reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Initially, it will be noted that Kawasaki et al. appears to be directed towards a display system that is adapted to be mounted over the shoulder of the seat occupant. The system can display a high quality image onto a display area supported from the back portion of a different seat located in front of the occupant. Thus, while Kawasaki does involve projecting an image from some form of projector, the system of Kawasaki is not concerned with, and would not appear to be benefited by, an external sensor that is located adjacent a door to inform the projector system that the door is opened or closed. The Examiner has cited Markham as disclosing a system for detecting the presence of an individual at a door, and has stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the features of Markham into Kawasaki to produce the system of claim 1. However, it is most respectfully submitted that such a combination would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because the Kawasaki system simply would not have been benefited by, nor would have been

enhanced in operation or functionality, by such a feature. This feature is implemented in one preferred embodiment of the present invention because once the door to the mobile platform is closed, the display system no longer needs to display seat information because all of the occupants will likely be seated by that time, and continuing to project seat information could be distracting to the occupants. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that there is no desirability or motivation apparent from Kawasaki et al. for including the features disclosed in Markham.

A minor amendment has been made to claim 1 to even more positively point out that the system is to aid an individual in locating a specific one of said seats while said door is open. It is believed that this additional, very minor limitation further helps to distinguish claim 1 from the Kawasaki/Markham combination. Reconsideration and allowance of independent claim 1 and the dependent claims that depend from it is therefore respectfully requested.

#### **REJECTION OF CLAIMS 25 AND 32 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A)**

In the interests of expediting prosecution, claim 25 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 26. Claim 26 has been cancelled as has Claim 32. The dependency of claim 29 has been changed so that claim 29 depends from claim 25. It is believed that this removes the ground for rejection under §103(a) and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 7, 2005

By: 

Mark D. Elchuk  
Reg. No. 33,686

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600  
MDE/lkj